



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOME GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS RELATING TO GENESIS I.-XI.

By WILLIAM R. HARPER,
The University of Chicago.

The stories omitted.—The unique character of Genesis i.-xi.—The questions : as to the origin of the narrative ; as to the value and character of the material. —Three possible methods of procedure.—Three classes of minds.—A general review of the question of the analysis, or division into documents.—Difficulties raised by an acceptance of the analysis.—Difficulties removed by an acceptance of the analysis.

The story of the dispersion of nations and the tower of Babel will be passed over in this treatment, partly because an adequate treatment would require the use of more technical material than can with profit be published in THE BIBLICAL WORLD, and partly also in order that more space may be given to the general consideration of the material as a whole. These portions are omitted all the more willingly because, as a matter of fact, nothing really new would be contributed by them for the settlement of the general questions involved. The reader is given below a list of authorities from which he may construct his own treatment if he desires to undertake the work.

Literature:

- Dods*, Genesis.
- Kalisch*, Genesis
- Dillmann*, Die Genesis.
- Delitzsch* (Franz), Genesis.
- Lange*, Genesis.
- The Pulpit Commentary*, Genesis.
- Lenormant*, Beginnings of History, Vol. II.
- Schrader*, The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament.
- Harper and Green*, The Pentateuchal Question, Genesis i.-xii., Hebraica, Vol. V.
- Ewald*, History of Israel, Vol. I.
- Budde*, Die biblische Urgeschichte.
- Geikie*, Hours with the Bible, Vol. I.
- Knobel*, Die Völkertafel der Genesis.
- Kiepert*, in Phönikisch-hebräischen Urkunde (1859).

It is perhaps appropriate to analyze the portions omitted:
(1) The priestly writer furnishes a family history of Noah's sons in 10: 1-7, 20, 22, 23, 31, 32, also the family history of Shem 11: 10-26.

(2) The prophetic writer furnishes the story of the peopling of the earth from Noah's sons, 10: 8, 10-12, 13-19, 21, 24-30, and the story of the Tower of Babel and the Dispersion of Nations 11: 1-9.

The tables are evidently a continuation of the plan already indicated in the fourth chapter of the prophetic writer and the fifth chapter of the priestly writer. It is a part of the plan of both writers to preserve a chain of historical connection from the beginning down to the days of Israel. With reference to the story of the Tower of Babel it may be said: The fact was noted that diversity of language is a great inconvenience. What now is the significance of this? The teaching inculcated is (*a*) that this diversity is a punishment for sin; it is likewise (*b*) a barrier preventing men from combining for wicked purposes. The real purpose of the story was not to recount how language came to be diverse, but rather "to show the purpose served by the breaking up of man into diverse nations."

We now proceed to present a few general considerations with reference to the material of Gen. i.-xi. These are to be regarded as preparatory to a more formal discussion of the divine and human elements in these chapters which will be taken up in subsequent articles.

I. The Unique Character of Gen. i.-xi.

1. In comparison with other portions of sacred literature. One cannot find in any eleven consecutive chapters in all sacred literature, nor can one from the different books making up sacred literature, select eleven chapters which shall in any respect resemble the first eleven chapters of Genesis, the

Literature (continued):

Lagarde, in *Ges. Abhandlungen* (1866).

Fr'd Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?*

Rawlinson, *The Origin of Nations*.

subject thus far of our study. In what particulars do these chapters differ from all other chapters of Holy Writ? In what respect are they unique? (1) *In scope.* All that portion of the Bible which treats of general history is found in these chapters, for the twelfth chapter introduces the special history of a nation. Of the four thousand years, which, according to the accepted chronology, passed before the coming of the Christ, these eleven chapters cover one half, the remainder of the Old Testament being given up to the other half. In these chapters we find the beginnings of those things on which to-day the world's scientific and philosophic thinking is engaged. (2) *In the magnitude of the themes.* It is only necessary to mention some of these themes; for example, the origin of life, the origin of sin, the beginnings of civilization, the dispersion of nations, the confusion of tongues. (3) *In choice of selection.* We think sometimes that only a little of the lives of Samuel, Saul, and David are given us in the Books of Samuel, about fifty chapters. If the compiler of these books has omitted much material which might have been included, what shall we say of the compiler of the eleven chapters of Genesis who has, as a matter of fact, spoken of only eight or nine events in two thousand years? (4) *In relation to science.* It is in these chapters that the Bible is brought into contact with science. Here questions arise relating to astronomy, physics, geology, geography, biology, ethnology, and philology. The relation of the Bible to science will be settled by the decision in reference to these chapters. (5) *In being pre-Hebraic.* There is yet no Hebrew nation; there is yet no Hebrew language. (6) *In being pre-historic.* The period dealt with stands, as is acknowledged at least so far as concerns the Antediluvian part of it, before the beginning of history.

2. And again, one cannot find in any literature, sacred or profane, a piece of composition which deserves in any proper sense a place beside these chapters. For every story here narrated we have been able, to be sure, to find many and most striking parallels; but two things will be remembered: (1) Not one of the hundreds of parallel narratives which we have examined could in any fairness be said to compare favorably with the

corresponding Hebrew story; and what is of greater moment, (2) in no other literature is there so full and complete a collection. What here is orderly and systematic is elsewhere fragmentary and disconnected.

It is true that in the Hebrew narrative there are fragments of three works. But let us notice and weigh well (1) the fact that there are three in one literature, and (2) that there was an editor whom some great purpose or influence led to make these three already great, still greater by the union.

II. The question is not a simple one.

To undertake its discussion even with the preparation we have tried to make in the space at our command is almost absurd. We may, however, state the question. Strictly speaking, there are two questions, the first relating to the origin of the narratives here combined, the second relating to the value and character of the facts narrated. It is impossible, however, to separate these questions and so we may regard them as two parts of one great question.

1. *As to the origin of the narratives.* 1) Are they like the similar stories of other literatures, wholly human in their origin, or has there entered into their composition some external, superhuman, supernatural influence, an influence which has left upon them a clear and unmistakable impress? 2) Granting that there has been present such a divine influence, what has been the method of this influence? Was the knowledge of the facts imparted by a special revelation, or did the divine influence limit itself to the guidance and direction of the author as he ascertained for himself, in whatsoever manner possible, the material here collected; as he interpreted, according to principles the purpose of the events which were transpiring about him?

2. *As to the value and character of the material.* 1) Whether of human or divine origin, is the material scientific in form and contents? Is it real Physical science or Geography or History? Or is it pure invention? Or is it in large part naturalistic myth? Or is it historical legend? What is it? 2) If we grant its divine origin in any sense and decide from the study of facts that

the material is something more than literal history, or that from the scientific point of view it is imperfect, inaccurate, how may these two things be reconciled ?

III. Possible methods of procedure.

1) *The traditional.*—In reference to these chapters and their contents, men living hundreds of years back, good and honest men ; the church through all its history, the Roman Catholic and the Protestant church ; our fathers and our teachers, our mothers and our preachers—in other words, *tradition* has entertained and taught a certain view. This view has been held for a long time by many great men. It has been instilled into our minds in the days of infancy. It has become a part of us. Whether false or true, it is on every side of us. It is our privilege, some think it a duty, to continue to hold it. It has answered for the past ; it is good enough for the present. To reject it, even to examine into it, will make trouble, will disturb the faith of many. It is better to let well enough alone. What our fathers have taught us, that let us teach our children. Shall we adopt this method of procedure ?

2) *The a priori method.*—We know what God is ; a perfect being. It is not difficult to determine the character of a revelation which such a one would make. It must be perfect. It must be scientifically accurate. It matters not what may have been the state of knowledge on any subject at the time of the original utterance. Coming from God, it must have been a final statement ; a statement at least in outline, which the development of human knowledge might fill out, but which, in no particular, such growth might really change. God being what he is, his revelation must have come in a certain way, and must be of a certain character. Knowing beforehand, therefore, what it ought to be, we may reasonably be allowed to find that which accords with our expectation. If there are facts which cannot easily be explained from this point of view, we must remember that this is the word of God, and that we poor, ignorant mortals have no business to suppose that we can understand everything. A great feature of the Bible is its mysterious character. It was never intended

to be thoroughly understood until the last day of all the world. Is this satisfactory?

3) *Inductive*.—Here are eleven chapters, narrating in a certain form, with a certain spirit, certain facts. Some of us have believed these chapters to have had a supernatural origin; some have thought them merely human productions. In both cases the belief has existed apart from any thorough study of the subject. What now shall we do, in order to arrive at an intelligent and truthful view of the case? Is it not clear?

(1) Examine every story here given in the strongest light we can find, comparing everything from which there is reasonable hope of securing help.

(2) Note down the facts or considerations which seem to indicate a human origin.

(3) Note down the facts or considerations which seem to indicate a divine origin.

(4) Consider how both classes of facts may be harmonized; in other words, seek a theory which shall cover all these facts.

(5) If heretofore we have seen only the human element, have doubted the existence of the divine, take a step forward, and, if the facts warrant, recognize here the hand of God.

(6) If heretofore we have seen only a divine element, and have not appreciated the human, take a step forward—it is always taking a step forward to recognize the truth—and acknowledge the human element. Let tradition have its true force. Let our conception of God also exert an influence, but let us decide this question on the basis of the facts.

IV. Three classes of minds.

It must not be forgotten in this last part of our work, that when we started upon it there were among us those who might be divided into three classes:

1) A first class, made up of individuals who maintained an unswerving faith in the accuracy, truth, and final authority of these chapters as respects both questions of history and science, and questions of a religious character.

2) A second class, made up of individuals who were conscien-

tiously skeptical in respect both to their historical and to their religious value. Here belonged not only those who did not, but as well some of those who did, believe in a special divine revelation.

3) A third class, made up of those who were wholly indifferent to the contents or the teaching of these chapters.

In any final summing up we must keep in mind all three classes.

Some of us have, all our lives, been blind, utterly blind, to the clearest evidence of a human element. We have been guilty of bibliolatry. It has never dawned upon us that God works from the inside as well as from the outside. We have thought that a voice spoken to the ear of a man was louder, more distinct than a voice spoken to his soul. We have been literalists, realists. We have degraded the very book we were attempting to lift up. What, now, ought this study to teach us? To see that God works through men; that such work must be limited, imperfect; to see that God is not so narrow, nor so small as we would make him; to learn that he has seen fit to allow his truth to appear, at least in some form to many nations and not merely to one; in short, the work, if it has been in any sense successful, ought to have broadened, somewhat, our horizon. Of course it will raise questions which at present we cannot answer; but we must not forget that the individual in whose mind all questions have been answered, all difficulties have been solved, has, by some mistake come to the wrong world. He does not belong here. He ought not to stay here.

Some of us have, all our lives, been blind, just as blind to the evidence, just as clear, of a divine element. We have been guilty of a sin, no worse than bibliolatry, but equally as baneful. It has never dawned on us that anything exists which we cannot comprehend. We have refused to see God's hand in all this, not, to be sure, because we fancied God too small, too insignificant; but because we fancied ourselves too great, too all-knowing. We have been skeptical, largely because of our self-conceit; and yet we have been as narrow, in our way, as the other class in their way. It is narrowness of vision, smallness of conception,

which has led us to pronounce as *only* human what is also divine. What should this investigation have for *us*? A broadening of the mind.

Some of us have been indifferent. Are we still so? If these strange narrations, these fundamental themes, these heaven-born teachings do not stir our souls, and make us more alert to the thought of man and the voice of God, it will require angels from heaven, or demons from hell to move us.

*V. A general review of the question of the analysis, or division into documents. What are the facts and the considerations?*¹

1. *Language*.—If we, provisionally, divide chaps. 1:1–12:5 into two portions, the division being based upon a difference of style (strongly marked), a difference of statement in the handling of practically the same material, a difference of theological conception, does this division find any support in the linguistic phenomena presented?

Let us consider the facts as obtained from an examination of the chapters (P, representing the priestly writer; J, the prophetic):

1) The total vocabulary of the section is.....	485 words.
2) Of the 485, those used by P alone number	118 "
3) " " " " " J "	246 "
4) " " P's total usage is therefore.....	239 "
5) " " J's " "	367 "
6) " " P and J use in common.....	121 "
7) The total occurrence of words in the section is.....	3727 "
8) Of the 3727 P has	1858 "
9) " " J "	1762 "
10) " " R ² "	107 "
11) P uses 239 words in 1858 forms, each word	7.77 times.
12) J uses 367 words in 1762 forms, "	4.8 "
13) P uses 239 words in about 150 verses, for each verse...	1.58 new words
14) J uses 367 words in about 140 verses, for each verse...	2.62 "
15) Of the 118 words used by P alone, those fairly characteristic number.....	56
16) Of the 246 words used by J alone, those fairly characteristic number.....	104

¹ From *Hebraica*, Vol. V., No. 1, pp. 63 ff.

² R represents the editor who joined together the priestly and prophetic narratives.

As has before been said, the argument from language possesses the least weight. It is only when connected with the others that its real influence is exerted. It cannot be accidental that, with a change of style, matter, and theology, there is also a change of language.

The fact that P uses only 239 words in 150 verses, and uses them in 1,858 forms is in striking contrast with J's usage of 367 words in 140 verses, used only in 1,762 forms. The accidental fact that P has only 1.58 new words for each verse, while J has 2.62, accords well with P's rigid, stereotyped, verbose, and repetitious style, as over against J's free and picturesque style.

In the consideration of this point, it must be remembered that we are not dealing with a modern language, nor even with an ancient language like Latin or Greek; but with a language remarkable for its inflexibility. When it is appreciated that writings acknowledged to be a thousand years apart present few more differences than are sometimes found in the work of one man in our times, these peculiarities, insignificant as they may appear, are nevertheless very noteworthy.

2. *Style*.—If we make a rough division of I : I-12 : 5 into two parts, basing it upon the occurrence, say, of twenty or twenty-five characteristic words, upon what seems to be a double treatment of the same subject, and a different conception of God, his relation to man, and man's relation to him, do we note in the division thus made any differences of style?

1) One part is found everywhere to be (*a*) systematic in the treatment of material; (*b*) chronological and statistical, not only in the character but also in the presentation of the material selected; (*c*) minute, precise, scientific; (*d*) rigid, stereotyped, condensed, in the mode of conception; but (*e*) verbose and repetitious in the form of expression; (*f*) generic, rather than individual.

2) The second part is found everywhere to be (*a*) free and flowing, without sharp distinctions or classification; (*b*) marked by the presence of stories and traditions, but lacking all numbers and dates except those of a most general character; (*c*) picturesque and poetical both in conception and expression, introduc-

ing frequently pieces of a poetic character ; (*d*) highly anthropomorphic in all representations of God ; (*e*) prophetic, predictive, didactic ; (*f*) individual, rather than generic.

Can it be a mere coincidence that those same portions which have a given vocabulary, always have the same characteristics of style ? Furthermore, is it not strange that there is so close a connection between the vocabulary of each of these writers and his style ? No one would for a moment think of combining the vocabulary of the one with the style of the other. Such a combination would at once be felt to be incongruous.

3. *Material*.—If we made a rough division of 1 : 1-12 : 5 into two parts, basing it upon the occurrence of characteristic words, upon differences of style, and upon differences in theological conception, what do we find as to the material of these divisions ?

1) A duplication of the same material : (*a*) In one division (1) an account of creation ; (2) a genealogical table of ten generations to Noah ; (3) a statement of the world's wickedness ; (4) a great flood sent as a punishment for this wickedness ; (5) the deliverance of one family and of representatives of all kinds of beasts ; (6) covenant and promise never to inflict a similar punishment ; (7) a table of nations ; (8) another genealogical table to Abram ; (9) the family and migration of Abram.

(*b*) In the second division : (1) an account of creation, with a story of the fall and expulsion from Eden ; (2) a genealogical table of seven generations (with practically the same names as in the other division), together with the story of Cain and Abel ; (3) a statement of the world's wickedness, with the story of the sons of God and daughters of men ; (4) a great flood sent as a punishment for this wickedness ; (5) the deliverance of one family and of representatives of all kinds of beasts ; (6) sacrifice and promise not to repeat the punishment ; (7) a table of nations, with a story of Noah's drunkenness and Canaan's curse ; (8) traces of a genealogical table to Abram ; (9) the family and migration of Abram.

2) Differences, discrepancies, and contradictions of such a character as absolutely to forbid the supposition that they have come from one hand (space need not be taken to repeat these).

It is said : If there are so many discrepancies and contradictions as to make it impossible to conceive of the work as the labor of one author, how is it possible to explain it as the work of a Redactor? Will an editor be any more likely than an author to combine contradictory matter in one piece? This question may be answered by noting (1) that an editor has done just this thing in Samuel (*e. g.* the different and even contradictory stories of (1) the desire of the people for a king; (2) the appointment of Saul as king; (3) the introduction of David at court), and elsewhere; (2) that much of the roughness was covered up by the insertions of the Redactor; (3) that in those days among all nations, and especially among the Semitic nations, there was an utter lack of that precision and scientific disposition characteristic of the present.

Can it be a mere coincidence that, in one description of a given event, there should be found one vocabulary, and one style of speech, while in another description of this same event, the style and language are different? Furthermore, is it not strange that there is such a harmony, as has been found in the language, style, and material of each division. Would any one think of putting P's material into J's language and style?

But is not this, in itself, a consideration in favor of unity of authorship? Every writer changes his style and language in treating of different subjects. Yet (1) does the same author use two vocabularies, and two kinds of style in successive chapters? Does he write one paragraph in a chapter with one set of words and in one style, a second paragraph with another set of words and in another style? Does he write one verse, or half-verse, in one way, and the following verse, or half-verse, in another? Would he keep up this sort of thing verse after verse, chapter after chapter, through several volumes? (2) Does the same writer often tell a story, or furnish a list of names, or describe an event in one vocabulary and with one style, and then tell the same story, or furnish the same list of events, or describe the same event with another set of words and in another style? (3) Does the same author repeat a story, or a list, or a description, immediately after having first given it, and in the repeated

form furnish matter so different and contradictory that for thousands of years men have believed the second statement in every case to be not a second account of the same thing, but an account of a second and different thing?

4. *Theology*.—If we separate 1:1-12:5 into two divisions, on the basis of characteristic words and phrases, style, similarity, and at the same time difference of material, we find that each division is marked also by a different conception of God (accompanied by the use of a different word), of man's relations to God, of the proper modes of worship, of God's action in History. These differences may be briefly summed up:

1) In one division we find (*a*) a rigidly monotheistic spirit, no word or expression occurring which could possibly be interpreted otherwise; (*b*) a lofty, dignified conception of God as powerful and benevolent; (*c*) a magnifying and dignifying of the supernatural; (*d*) man so far beneath his Creator as to give no occasion for any divine jealousy or alarm; (*e*) a strict adherence to an idea of progressive revelation, which shows itself in the selection of a few great legal enactments set forth in a skeleton of history; (*f*) a conscientious withholding from any reference to God as the Covenant-God (Jehovah), to sacrifice, altars, clean and unclean, or ceremonial institutions of any kind.

2) In the other we find (*a*) a spirit which can scarcely be called monotheistic in the strictest sense; (*b*) a representation of God as a supernatural being, whose rights are threatened by man's presumption, who "breathes," "walks," "comes down from heaven," etc.; (*c*) a dispensing, so far as possible, with divine aid, the heroes doing what seems the natural thing to do; (*d*) man sustaining free and confidential relations with Yahweh and the heavenly beings; (*e*) an utter indifference to the historical development of religious ideas; (*f*) the existence from the beginning of a definite ceremonial system, including altars, sacrifice, distinction of clean and unclean, etc.

We thus see that, from whatever point of view the material of 1:1-12:5 is regarded, there are such differences as to demand the hypothesis of at least two writers. Each argument by itself, with the exception of that from language, would seem to be

sufficient; but when each argument strengthens, and is strengthened by all the rest, the case becomes still more clear.

But let us look at it in another way: (1) We divide these chapters into two divisions, simply on the basis of the use of the divine names, regarding as doubtful chaps. 2, 3, which have the double phrase Yahweh Elohim; (2) we go through each division and note the language; we discover many words and phrases which occur in one but not in the other; words and phrases, too, for which, in the other division, corresponding expressions are found; it seems strange that wherever Elohim is used, it is accompanied by a certain series of words, and that it is just so in the use of Yahweh; (3) we go through again, and we discover that one division has everywhere a certain style (rigid, stereotyped, etc.), and that the other has a style quite the opposite (free, flowing, poetical); (4) we examine the passages again, and this time discover that really each division takes up the same events, the same history (creation, deluge, etc.); (5) we take it up again, and, to our surprise, notice that each division, in spite of the similarity of material, has its own peculiar and widely different conception of God, etc. What must be the result of this five-fold examination? Is this the work of one man or two?

5. *The Redactor*.—Manifestly if there were two writers, and the work of both is now one piece, some one must have joined the two. In doing this he acted in accordance with the spirit of his times, as regulated by his purpose in making the combination. His spirit is far from being a critical one. He did not hesitate to use his material in any way which would best subserve his aim. He inserted and omitted; changed and arranged. He handled the sources used as freely as if he had been the author. The question of the time, etc., of this Redactor does not belong here.

VI. Difficulties raised by an acceptance of the analysis of these chapters.

The following difficulties will arise in the mind of the student; it is only proper to face them:

1) If there is an analysis, much that is said in dictionaries and books on synonyms is valueless, inasmuch as two words which have heretofore been regarded and interpreted as expressions of different thought on the part of one author, and therefore as very significant, turn out to be merely the variant expressions of the same thought on the part of two authors.

2) If there is an analysis, interpretations based upon the sudden change of style, supposing it all to be the work of one author (*e. g.*, from a dead, rigid style to a living, vigorous style, indicative of force, or characteristic of an eye-witness), must now be dropped, since this is merely an individual characteristic.

3) If there is an analysis, the sacred record can no longer be claimed to present a perfectly accurate account of these early times, for conflicting accounts stand side by side; changes have been arbitrarily introduced into the text; insertions and omissions have been made; the material cannot be called in a modern sense historical.

4) If there is an analysis, there are two very different, though perhaps not contradictory, conceptions of God, one of which seems to border closely on polytheism. How is it possible for so low (this is the proper term) an idea of God to have been incorporated in the Sacred Scriptures?

5) If there is an analysis, one is at a loss really to know whether sacrifices, altars, distinctions of clean and unclean, the name of Yahweh, etc., existed from the earliest times or not. One writer represents all these things as in existence; the other does not. Both certainly cannot be right.

6) If there is an analysis, even these chapters furnish enough to show that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch; for if Gen. 1-12 was written long after Moses' death, it is presumable that the other portions of the Hexateuch which follow and connect with these chapters belong also to a later date.

7) If there is an analysis, and Moses did not write the Pentateuch, the New Testament authorities, among others Jesus himself, who seem to say that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, or at any rate to imply this, either must have been ignorant of the

facts in the case, or knowing them, must have (1) consciously taught falsely, or (2) accommodated themselves to the literary suppositions of their day. Each of these possibilities is attended with difficulties.

8) If there is an analysis, it is probable that other Old Testament books will be found to have been put together in the same way, *e. g.*, Samuel, Kings. The discourses of the prophets, *e. g.*, Isaiah, Zechariah, may, likewise, be found to have been thrown together without much regard to time or order by later editors. The same lack of accuracy, the same proleptic method of handling material will be found to characterize many of the Old Testament so-called historical and prophetic writings.

9) If all this is true, the character of the Old Testament material, whether viewed (*a*) from an archaeological, (*b*) from an historical, and especially (*c*) from a religious point of view, must be estimated somewhat differently from the method commonly in vogue. It is not historical in the ordinary sense of that term.

VII. Difficulties relieved by an acceptance of the analysis.

While in the minds of some difficulties will arise; in the minds of others who have long been troubled, certain difficulties will be relieved. It must be noted, however, that while these twelve chapters alone suggest nearly all the difficulties which the Hexateuch as a whole, raises, a study of the Hexateuch is needed to reach conclusions which will relieve all the difficulties that have been felt by students in relation to this particular division of biblical material.

1) The material having come from two or three different writers, it is easy to understand why in this chapter a certain word or phrase (*e. g.*, "created," "God," "male and female") was employed, while in the following chapter in the same connection and in expressing the same thought used in an entirely different word (*e. g.*, "made," "Jehovah," "man and his wife"). It is true, the commentators have explained all this; but as a matter of fact their explanations occasion more trouble than did the original difficulty.

2) The material having come from two or three different writers, these sudden and inexplicable changes of style, in successive chapters, in the middle of a chapter, and even in the middle of a verse, become very clear.

3) There being different writers, the small inaccuracies, which could hardly be accounted for if one writer was the author of the whole, now have an explanation. It is not worth while to deny the existence of these inaccuracies; only ignorance of what constitutes an inaccuracy, or a perverse prejudice will fail to detect them. It is only natural that in material collected from different sources, handled by various Redactors, such should have arisen.

4) There being two or more writers, it is easy to understand how there have come down to us, side by side, two accounts of creation, two genealogical tables, two stories of the deluge, two accounts of the peopling of the earth, etc., etc. While it would be inconceivable that one man should duplicate his own material in such a way, taking pains to change his vocabulary, style, theology, and even the material itself, there is no difficulty in explaining the material as written originally by different men. The harmonizing absolutely required, and as absolutely unattainable, if one writer was understood to have written all, is no longer even necessary if there are two. Besides, we have now two different accounts of the same event, in other words, double testimony; and although this testimony is not always consistent, such, under all the circumstances, could scarcely be expected. Do we expect of the early times a perfect morality? or a morality judged by the standard of our times? Then why expect a perfect historiography?

5) There being two or more writers, the different theological conceptions which are so evident in these chapters receive explanation. It is clear that the Israelites, from the beginning, did not have the New Testament theological conceptions, as most commentators have endeavored to show. Just as there was a marked imperfection in their ideas of morality, an imperfection which could only be removed by degrees, so their ideas of God, though communicated to them from Heaven itself, were imper-

fect, far short of what they afterwards attained; far different from the ideas taught in the New Testament. They could not comprehend the real truth. They were children in religious faith, and even God himself must deal with them as such and not as men. This removes the many "moral" difficulties of the Old Testament. If these people knew God as we know him, if their ideas of him were such as we to-day entertain, how could they have committed such sins as those with which they are so frequently charged? How could they so frequently have fallen into idolatry? Their shortcomings as a nation and as individuals are better appreciated when once we realize that they lived not in the splendor of the New Testament Christianity, but at the breaking dawn of Old Testament monotheism. Whatever may be said as to the relative ages of the theological conceptions of the priestly and the prophetic writers, the two, though apparently inconsistent, present God in aspects which were, are, and always will be true.

6) There being two or more writers in the Pentateuch, the method of composition being therefore compilation, we have harmony as to method between this portion of Sacred Scripture and all other portions (*e. g.*, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and even the Gospels of the New Testament). It is true that compilation is to-day regarded as the lowest order of composition. The mere compiler is not treated as an author. It would seem to injure the character of these books, if they are declared to be compilations. Still, even the most conservative scholars have long recognized the existence of various documents (in an undigested form) in these and other books. Now if this was the method employed as far down as New Testament times, it is difficult to believe that a higher method was employed so far back as the time in which the Pentateuch is asserted to have had its origin. We must apply the same principle here as elsewhere. We do not expect to find at this early period the highest standards of morality, or the highest conceptions of God. Why then should we look for the highest form of literary composition? We know that it was the child age. To find a far more perfect form of composition than existed when the nation had become

civilized and cultured is inconceivable. A great difficulty is therefore removed by this representation.

And here, in the midst of the whole matter, we leave it. In the remaining papers we shall endeavor to show (1) the human element which forms so large a part of this material, and (2) the divine element, which overwhelms and controls the human, but without hiding it from view. The reader is requested, meanwhile, to remember that in the statement made above, an effort has been made, honestly and candidly to present the difficulties on both sides of this vexed question. The arguments for the divine character will be found to be independent of the question of an analysis. The constructive side of the question is yet to follow.